

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 4, 10, 15 and 18 have been amended. Applicant is not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution. Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 1-14 and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Gupta *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,752 B1), hereafter "Gupta."

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

The Office has asserted that claims 1-9 are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office indicates that the limitation "during a session" of claim 1 is unclear. Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite "...during a session with the network application." Applicant asserts that this amendment further clarifies the invention. In addition, Applicant respectfully points out that the Examiner's statement that "[t]o establish a session one ordinarily [sic] skilled in the art would need a client/server environment," indicates, assuming the Office is correct, that one of

ordinary skill in the art would know what needed to be provided in order to practice the teachings of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office further objects to the limitation “the session may have expired” in claim 4. Applicant has amended claim 4 to recite “...determining if it is likely that the session has expired.” Applicant asserts that this amendment further clarifies the invention. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office further objects to the limitation “sending a request to the network application” and “determining if a login page is received...in response to the request,” of claim 5, stating that it is not clear why one would need a login page if one would send a request to the network application. Applicant respectfully submits that a login page may be received in response to a request to a network application, *inter alia*, in the case that a session with the network application has timed out. For example, if an attorney were attempting to electronically file a response to an Office Action on the USPTO web site and waited too long between actions, the attorney’s next submission would return a login page. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claim is clear as written and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office still further objects to the limitations “session time” and “the determining step” of claim 6. With respect to the former, Applicant respectfully submits that the limitation should be properly read as “session time remaining” which may be interpreted, *inter alia*, as time remaining in a session. With respect to the last, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 depends from claim 4, which depends from claim 1. The only determining in either of claims 1 or 4 is “...determining if it is likely that the session has expired,” of claim 4. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that it is clear from the context of the claims that the limitation “the

determining step” of claim 6 refers back to claim 4. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejection.

B. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-14 AND 18-22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office has rejected claims 1-14 and 18-22 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Office states that claims 1 and 10 raise a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10 to recite “[a] computer implemented method.” Further, the Office objects to the form of claim 18. Applicant has amended claim 18 to recite “...[a] program product stored on a computer readable medium.” Applicant submits that these amendments further comport with the Office’s interpretation of patentable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

C. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection over Gupta, Applicant asserts that Gupta does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 1, 10, 15 and 18, Applicant submits that Gupta fails to teach that the application data is submitted to the network application without reentry by a user in case that the session has expired. Rather, Gupta is concerned with authenticating a user once for a variety of applications. However, Gupta does not teach that a user may submit information in an expired session without having to reenter the information. In contrast, the claimed inventions include “...wherein the application data is submitted to the network application without reentry by a user

in case that the session has expired.” Claim 1. As such, unlike Gupta, the application data of the claimed invention is submitted to the network application in case that the session has expired without the user having to reenter the application data. Thus, Gupta does not teach the submission of data to the network application of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With respect to dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicant submits that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office’s interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office’s combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office’s combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593

Date: July 9, 2007

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

RAD/hew